DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 189 HE 018 098

AUTHOR McAnulty, Brenda Hart; And Others
TITLE Analysis of Student and Faculty Opinion of Academic Advisement Services.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Academic Affairs Administrators Conference (18th).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; College Faculty; *College Students; *Counselor Role; *Faculty Advisers; Higher Education; Inservice Education; Questionnaires; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *University of Louisville KY

ABSTRACT

Views of 335 students and 25 faculty members concerning academic advising and the role of the adviser were surveyed at the University of Louisville's Speed Scientific School. About 75 percent of the students rated their advisers as excellent or good. A large percentage of the faculty reported multiple adviser/advisee contacts each year. A small minority of students felt a need for more time with their advisers. Seventy-two percent of the faculty felt they should not be responsible for providing information on campus resources or on university rules and regulations. Eighty-four percent of the advisers indicated that it was important to have some understanding of the advisee's personal problems, and 80 percent of the students rated their advisers as excellent or good in being positive or friendly. About 72 percent of the faculty had not received special aid or training to prepare them for advising responsibility, and 56 percent felt workshops or departmental training would be helpful. Eight suggestions for improving advising are offered, including reducing the adviser/advisee ratio and increasing faculty time available for advising, and implementing inservice adviser training. A faculty questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253189

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT AND FACULTY OPINION OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT SERVICES

Prof. Brenda Hart McAnulty
Dr. Carol Alf O'Connor
Ms. Libby Sklare
Speed Scientific School
University of Louisville

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Brenda McAnulty
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

As college student enrollment continues to decline on a national level, faculty and administrators alike are beginning to seek ways in which to attract and retain students. The quality of the academic advising provided to an institution's students is one factor being carefully scrutinized. As Dr. Lee Noel discussed in his key note address at NACADA's 7th Annual Conference held in St. Louis, MO (October, 1983) "a well conceived academic advising program reduces the institution's drop out rate, is linked to the student's achievement and overall learning, and helps the institution maintain academic standards." In short, a good academic advising program "improves the quality of life for all who teach, study, or work at the institution."

However, discussions of inadequate academic advising has been presented in student personnel literature (Borgard, Hornbuckle and Mahoney, 1977). Furthermore, students frequently complain about academic advisors not being available and about the poor quality of advising actually received. Whether an institution employs faculty, staff, peer advisors or a combination of the above, with or without computer assisted advising, complaints still arise. Many factors contribute to this problem and there is no ideal advising mode in existence. One factor to be considered is that faculty members and students may perceive the role of the academic advisor in different ways (Crookston, 1970). There may be substantial disagreement among both groups regarding the duties and responsibilities of advisors. Students may want advisors to be student centered, serving as a friend, supporter, counselor. On the other hand, faculty members may see their advising role as solely directive, providing program information only. If inadequate academic advising is indeed a problem needing to be improved, it is first necessary to survey faculty and student opinions concerning the overall process of academic advising and the role of the advisor.

During 1976 Linda Stabler (Department of Testing and Evaluation, San Jose State University) coordinated a project to evaluate the quality of advisement services provided to students. Both students and faculty were asked to respond to questionnaires dealing with the advising process. Having reviewed the data analysis prepared by Ms. Stabler, personnel at the Speed Scientific School of the University of Louisville decided to conduct a similar study. During the spring, 1983 advising period a project was undertaken to evaluate the quality of advising provided to our students. A total of 335 students and 28 advisors responded to two different questionnaires dealing with the process of academic advising. This marked the first time the process of academic advising had been evaluated by faculty and students of our college and it is believed that the data obtained can be of value to other college units. This paper will present the data and will provide suggestions for improving the quality of academic advising.

NE 018 098

METHOD

Description of Faculty Sample and Questionnaire

In the Spring of 1983 all faculty members at the Speed Scientific School were asked to respond to a questionnaire dealing with the quality and problems of academic advising. In addition, the full time staff members who had the responsibility for academic advising were also provided questionnaires.

For the purpose of reporting back to Speed School faculty on the results of the study, I chose to examine only the responses of the 25 faculty members participants. Because I believe Speed faculty would be more interested in the responses of their own group, I isolated the staff responses.

A total of 25 completed questionnaires were returned, representing an unadjusted return rate of 35.7%. Analysis of the respondents indicated that each department within Speed was adequately sampled, with the exception of the Industrial Engineering Department which chose not to participate in the study (Table 1).

The faculty questionnaire consisted of two parts (See Appendix A). The first part contained 18 general questions dealing with the advising process. For example, respondents were asked to select areas in which students should expect to receive information from their advisors. The second part of the questionnaire was designed to be answered only by those faculty who were currently serving as advisors or who had served in this capacity within the past two academic years. The questions in this section dealt with such things as the advisor's availability, number of advisees assigned, and the number of advisor/advisee contacts.

Analysis of the faculty sample by status (Table 2) and rank (Table 3) yielded rather interesting results. Analysis of the sample by status indicated that the sample over-represented tenured faculty members and under-represented probationary and temporary faculty (Table 2). Such under-representation of probationary and temporary faculty may reflect the infrequency with which temporary faculty are asked to serve as advisors. It also seems justifiable to conclude that tenured faculty members serve as advisors more frequently. Comparisons made on the basis of academic rank revealed that full professors were over-represented while assistant professors were under-represented in the sample (Table 3). The largest group of respondents (72%) indicated that they served as advisors for undergraduate students.

Description of Student Sample and Questionnaire

During the Spring, 1983 period of pre-registration, all students enrolled at the Speed Scientific School of the University of Louisville were asked to complete a questionnaire about academic advising. Questionnaires were provided to all faculty members of the school in order for them to distribute them to their advisees.

(*The Chairman of the Department of Industrial Engineering chose for his students and faculty members not to participate in the study.) Enrollment at the Speed School during the spring, 1983 semester was 2049 students (not including the IE majors). Forms were returned by 335 students, representing an unadjusted return rate of 20.02% (Table 4). Of the total number of students returning the survey forms, 45.5% were freshmen and 54.5% were sophomores.

It should be noted that the advising questionnaire consisted of two distinct parts. Section I sought to obtain general information from the student and contained general questions regarding advising services. Section II contained 11 questions that required the student to rate the quality and importance of advising. This section was only to be completed if adequate time had been spent with an advisor so the student could evaluate effectiveness.

RESULTS

A direct comparison of the faculty and student responses to the survey is difficult to make because the questionnaires utilized were different. In an attempt to analyze the responses, the questions were grouped under the following headings: Advising Procedure, Advisor Availability, Advisor/Advisee Contacts, Duties of Advisors, Quality of Advising, Advisor Information and Training, Importance of Advising to Faculty, and Problems in Advising. Data summarizing faculty and student responses in these eight areas are presented on the following pages.

Advising Procedure

Questions in this section dealt with who should have responsibility for advising students and how advising should be done. The questions were asked mainly of faculty; few comparable questions appear on the student questionnaire. The overwhelming majority of faculty respondents (89.3%) believed they should be involved in academic advising rather than simply having students "advise" themselves. The vast majority (91.6%) believed that students should be assigned to specific advisors. Most respondents (79.1%) felt that students should not be allowed to choose their own advisors, probably agreeing with the one individual who wrote the comment that students would choose the "most popular" faculty members to serve as advisors. Assuming students do not change majors, 79.1% of the faculty advisors indicated that students should retain the same advisor.

Faculty were asked to compare methods of advising, such as one-to-one advisor/advisee contacts, advising in large groups, and "self advising" where students would simply read bulletins and college publications. The one-to-one method was first choice (83.3%) with group advising seldom listed as top choice (8.3%). "Self advising" was the least preferred method of advising. It is evident from these data that most faculty advisors agree that the current system of assigning advisors and dealing with student advising through one-to-one contacts is preferable to mass advising or "self" advising.

Advisor Availability

In this section an attempt is made to compare student responses regarding availability of advisors with faculty responses. Of those students who responded to both parts of the questionnaire, 89.9% indicated that they knew who their advisor was (Table 5). With regard to advisor accessibility, 53.5% of the total student participants responded that it was very easy to arrange an appointment with their academic advisor. Another 22.7% responded that it was somewhat easy. Only 1.5% responded that it was somewhat difficult which is rather surprising when one considers the frequently-heard student complaint that advisors are hard to find. Apparently, most advisors are available to their advisees when needed (Table 6).

In examining the issue of advisor availability, the authors sought to determine the number of advisees assigned to individual faculty advisors. Over half (61.1%) of the faculty advisors reported that they are assigned more than 15 advisees (Table 7). This seems to be quite a large number of advisees per faculty member given the extent of other academic responsibilities.

When asked about the number of office hours made available for student contacts, 47% of the faculty participants reported that their offices were always open for advising. Another 23.5% indicated that they held up to 10 office hours per week and another 23.5% reported holding between 10 and 20 office hours per week for advising (Table 8).

Even with these large numbers of hours per week, 52.9% of the faculty advisors indicated that they needed to increase their office hours at least occasionally to meet advising demands, especially during periods of pre-registration and registration. Problems in the area of advisor availability could be alleviated by assigning more faculty members to serve as advisors so the advisor/advisee ratio is smaller. It seems unfair to ask current advisors to increase their number of advisees or to hold additional office hours when the burden of advising is already heavy.

Advisor/Advisee Contacts

With regard to the student respondents, 62.2% indicated that they met with their advisor two or three times per semester. However, 26.4% indicated that they usually met with their advisor only once a year. Faculty advisors, however, indicated a different response. 72.2% of the advisors reported seeing their typical advisees 2-3 times per academic year with the rest (27.8) indicating contact 4 or more times per academic year. None of the advisors indicated seeing their advisees only once a year.

When asked the average amount of time spent in an advisor/advisee meeting, 68.3% of the students indicated about 15 minutes, and about one-fifth (19.8%) indicated that the meetings lasted less than 5 minutes. Only 8.7% reported the sessions lasting about 30 minutes. Advisors' estimates of time spent with advisees tended to be greater than those reported by students. Only one faculty member indicated spending less than 15 minutes during a typical advising session. More than one fourth (27.8%) of the faculty advisors indicated spending about 30 minutes per session. It is apparent that there is substantial disagreement between students and advisors regarding the length of typical advisor/advisee contacts, with advisors consistently estimating those contacts to last longer (Table 9).

Most students (84.2%) indicated that their advisors usually allowed adequate time to discuss their academic programs when they met; only 3% of the students rated their advisors "fair" or "poor" in this area.

Duties of Advisors

The data in this section are drawn from the faculty questionnaire since no comparable questions appear on the student form. Advisor agreement on their duties will be compared in the next section to the quality of advising reported by students. The advisors seemed to have a very broad conception of their role as evidenced by the breadth of information most indicated they should be able to provide to advisees. There was total agreement that advisors should provide information on major requirements, and the majority (68%) indicated they should give information on general educational requirements. More than three-fourths (80%) of the advisors indicated that they should be able to provide information on career, graduate and professional school plans and the same percentage (80%) felt that advisors should give information on planning class schedules. Most advisors (56%) also indicated that they should provide assistance with their personal problems of their advisees. However, 72% of the advisors felt they should not be responsible for providing information on campus resources nor (72%) on university rules and regulations.

When asked how important it is for an advisor to know his/her advisees well enough to know them by name, 56% of the advisors indicated that it was very important, with another 24% indicating that it was somewhat important. Only 12% indicated that it was not important. When asked how important it is for an advisor to have some understanding of the advisee's personal and/or learning problems, 84% responded that this is of moderate or great importance. Thus it is evident that most respondents feel that academic advising should be at least somewhat personalized.

In looking at student responses, 80% of the students rated their advisors as "excellent" or "good" in showing a positive, friendly attitude toward the advisee. Only 7.5% rated their advisor as "fair" to "poor".

Quality of Advising

The highest rating of advising services by students were in the areas of explanations of major requirements (75.4% of students rated this category "excellent" or "good"), interest and positive, friendly attitude of advisor toward advisee (80% rated the advisor as "excellent" or "good"), and the general estimate of whether the advisor's services met the needs of the advisee (83.3% rated as "excellent" or "good"). More than half of the student respondents rated the following areas as "excellent to good": explanations of university and general educational requirements (74.5%); assistance in selecting courses and planning the educational program of the advisee (78%); understanding the advisee's educational goals and concerns (70.9%).

Many students (44.9%) responded "not applicable" to the question on advisor assistance in making career, graduate or professional school plans; 49.7% rated these services as "excellent" or "good" with only 5.4% rating them as "fair" or "poor". Apparently quite a few students found many of the advising areas to be inapplicable to their advisor or had not requested such information from the advisor. More than one-third (34%) responded "not applicable" to the question regarding knowledge of campus resources, with 62% giving a rating of "excellent" or "good" and 4% rating services in this area as "fair" to "poor". When the "not applicable" student responses are combined with the "good" and "excellent" responses, the percentages of student and faculty advisor responses to each area are relatively similar.

Student data regarding quality of advising are fairly consistent with faculty data related to the duties of advisors. Faculty seem to be doing a good job of providing advising in those areas in which they feel they should provide information. In areas that advisors do not perceive to be as important, student ratings of services are lower (i.e., information on campus resources and university requirements).

Consistent with 83.3% of student respondents indicating that their advisors did a good job of meeting student needs, 72% of faculty advisors rated the advising services in their department as "excellent" or "good". Only 5.5% of the student respondents indicated that their advisors rated "fair" or "poor in meeting the student's advising needs, and only 4% of the advisors rated as "fair" the effectiveness of services in their department.

Advisor Information and Training

Data received from advisors indicated that few were familiar with important advising resources. Over two-thirds (72.2%) indicated that they had not received any special assistance or training to prepare them for advising responsibilities. When asked if they believed that workshops or departmental training sessions on academic advising techniques would be helpful, 56% responded affirmatively. It is clear that the majority of advisors perceive a need for more information regarding advising. Data considered in the previous section indicate that general university requirements and campus resources are at least two areas in which more information is needed by advisors.

Advisors also responded to several questions on the need for and availability of information about the advisee. More than three-forths (88%) indicated advisors should have access to pertinent information about the advisee. All stated that transcripts and tests scores should be made available and all indicated that such records are usually available to them.

Importance of Advisement to Faculty

Several questions on the faculty form related to the use of advising duties to balance out-of-classroom responsibilities. A majority (66.7%) stated that advisors should be relieved of some committee responsibilities; 62.5% selected departmental committees; 45.8% selected school committees, and 37.5% indicated university committees. More than half (60.9%) stated that the quality of an advisor's advising services should be a voluntary, supplemental category if used in the promotion and tenure process or in merit evaluations.

Three-fourths of the advisors (75%) were against having advising serve as a mandatory, separate category and three advisors (11.5%) wrote in comments against using the quality of advising services in any type of promotion and tenure or merit evaluation.

A further question related to the weighting that advising should be given in an evaluation process. Half of the advisors (52%) agreed that it should be given modest weight while most of the remaining advisors (43%) were in favor of assigning "no or little weight". More than half (69.9%) of the advisors indicated that annual evaluations of academic advisors should be done for the advisor's information only. Advisors did not (73.9%) feel that annual evaluations should be used in the promotion and tenure or merit evaluation process.

Advising Problems

Faculty advisors were invited to write in comments on the survey forms. Advisors were specifically asked to comment on major or recurring problems which they encountered. The most frequently mentioned problems were students wanting to take what they want to without regard to school regulations, prerequisites, etc.; requirements changing; closed classes; and students waiting until the last minute to be advised.

DISCUSSION

In this section, a brief summary of the results will be given and recommendations on ways to improve the advising process will be provided. As noted by Crookston (1970), advisors and advisees may perceive the role of the advisor in different ways. This was found to be the case in Linda Stabler's research at San Jose State University in the areas of Advising Procedure and Advisor Availability. In our study at the Speed School, however, there appeared to be substantial agreement among advisors and students in most areas. With regard to the advisor's role, among the advisors there was total agreement that they should provide their advisees with information on major requirements. Over three-fourths of the student respondents (75.4%) rated their advisors as excellent or good in this category.

A large percentage of advisors reported multiple Advisor/Advisee Contacts each year, although there is some disagreement between faculty and students regarding the frequency and duration of these contacts. The length and frequency of the sessions appears to be sufficient for most advisees, with only a small minority reporting that they need more time with their advisors. Faculty advisors appear to have had a broad conception of the Duties of Advisors, although a majority (72%) felt that they should not be responsible for providing information on campus resources nor (72%) on university rules and regulations. With regard to the personalized aspects of academic advising, most faculty advisors (84%) indicated that it was important to have some understanding of the advisee's personal problems and most students (80%) rated their advisors as "excellent" or "good" in showing a positive, friendly attitude toward them.

Student data regarding the Quality of Advising are rather consistent with advisor data rating the importance of various advising duties. Faculty seem to be doing a good job of advising in those areas they feel they should provide information. In areas such as general university requirements and campus resources which advisors feel are less important, many students (34%) responded "not applicable" which may indicate that such information had not been requested of the advisor. Most advisors did not feel it was their responsibility to provide such information and many students did not even request such information from the advisor. In general, about three-fourths of advisors and students rated advising services as "excellent" or "good".

The section regarding Advisor Information and Training substantiates the need for advisors to become more familiar with important advising resources. Most (72.2%) indicated that they had not received any special assistance or training to prepare them for advising responsibilities. And many (56%) indicated that they believed workshops or departmental training sessions would be helpful.

The data in the section on Importance of Advising to Faculty indicated that advisors would like advising to be included more systematically in the academic assignment process. A majority (66.7%) indicated that advisors should be relieved of some committee responsibilities and more than half (60.9%) indicated that using the quality of advising services in merit evaluation, or in the promotion and tenure process should be on a voluntary basis. In general, most advisors seemed to agree with Bess (1973) that services to students should be given greater emphasis in institutions of higher learning.

Our analysis of the results of these two surveys regarding the academic advising process have generated a number of suggestions to improve advising here at the Speed Scientific School.

1. The student advising load should be distributed more equitably among faculty so that the advisor/advisee ratio could be improved.

2. The amount of departmental faculty time available to academic advising should be increased, especially during periods of pre-registration and open registration.

3. Systematic and period in-service training programs for advisors should be developed and implemented.

4. Advisors should be given references which would enable them to provide accurate information on major requirements, general educational requirements and campus resources.

5. Advisors should be furnished with materials which would enable them to provide students with information about career opportunities and graduate school programs related to their academic discipline.

6. A periodic evaluation of academic advising effectiveness should be conducted and the results made available to the advisor being rated.

7. The university should encourage both students and advisors to integrate academic advising into the overall instructional process.

8. A reward system should be developed for faculty who demonstrate excellence in academic advising services.

While all of the above suggestions are important, those of us who have worked with this project feel that instituting some type of reward system for excellence in advising is mandatory. Without a reward system, it is unlikely that we will be able to motivate current advisors to improve their services or encourage other faculty to serve as advisors. Improvements in the overall academic advising process will be difficult unless the university (and at least the Speed Scientific School) actively demonstrates its concern in this area through the development of a reward system.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY MEMBERS
SPRING 1983

ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Each Speed School faculty member and student is being asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the academic advisement process. A major purpose of this questionnaire is for you, as faculty members, to determine how important you feel it is to serve as an academic advisor and whether the performance of advisors should be used in the Promotion and Tenure process as one criterion to judge overall effectiveness of academic assignment. Even though you may not currently be serving as an academic advisor, your responses to this questionnaire are most important. If you are currently an advisor, your responses are vital. Please respond to all questions as thoughtfully, honestly, and completely as possible. It should require no more than 15 minutes of your time. You need not give your name. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it directly to the General Engineering Studies Office through campus mail. Thank you for your cooperation in this project.

1. Your department _____

2. Academic rank _____

3. Which of the following best describes your status?
   Temporary ____
   Probationary ____
   Tenured ____

4. If you are currently serving as an advisor or have been an advisor within the past two academic years, please indicate your advisement area(s) (you may check more than one):
   ____ Undergraduate advisor for engineering students
   ____ Graduate advisor
   ____ Advisor for technology students
   ____ Not an advisor

5. Three methods of academic advising are listed below. Please rate each method on a scale from 1 to 3 in which 1 indicates the method you would prefer to use and 3 the method least desirable:
   ____ Mass advising groups led by qualified faculty members
   ____ One-to-one advisor-advisee contacts
   ____ Students reading the university bulletin, departmental publications and semester class schedules and "advising" themselves

6. Do you believe individual students should be assigned to specific advisors?
   Yes ____
   No ____
   If no, please suggest an alternative method _____
   _____
   If yes, please specify what types of information _____
   _____

7. Do you believe students can receive better academic advisement if they are allowed to choose their own advisor rather than being assigned to a specific advisor?
   Yes ____
   No ____

8. Should students retain the same advisor once they are admitted to a particular unit, assuming they do not change majors?
   Yes ____
   No ____

9. In which of the following areas should students expect to receive information from their advisors? (Check as many as desired)
   ____ University rules and regulations (e.g., residency requirements, grading policy, etc.)
   ____ General education requirements
   ____ Major requirements
   ____ University graduation requirements
   ____ Campus resources (e.g., student health, counseling services, etc.)
   ____ Career, graduate, and professional school plans
   ____ Planning class schedules
   ____ Personal problems

10. How important is it for an advisor to know his/her advisees well enough to recognize them and call them by name?
    Not important ____
    Somewhat important ____
    Moderately important ____
    Very important ____

11. How important is it for an advisor to have some understanding of the individual advisee's personal and/or learning problems?
    Not important ____
    Somewhat important ____
    Moderately important ____
    Very important ____

12 Do you believe that workshops or departmental training sessions on academic advising techniques or resources would be helpful?
   Yes ____
   No ____

13 Should advisors routinely have access to pertinent information about the advisee (e.g., placement test scores and transcripts)?
   Yes ____
   No ____

14. If a faculty member is assigned to be an advisor, should he/she be relieved of some committee responsibilities? (You may check more than one)
    Departmental ____
    School ____
    University ____
    Should not be relieved of committee assignments ____

15. If the quality of a faculty member's advisement services were used in the Promotion and Tenure process or in merit evaluations (e.g., to offset a limited creative or publication record, etc.), should it be:
    a. A voluntary, supplemental category? Yes ____ No ____
    b. A mandatory, separate category? Yes ____ No ____

16. If advisement were considered in the Promotion and Tenure process, or in merit evaluations, how much weight should it be given?
    No weight ____ Minimal weight ____ Modest weight ____
    Fairly heavy weight ____ Very heavy weight ____

17. Are you in favor of students completing an annual evaluation of all academic advisors, by name and department?
    a. For use in the Promotion and Tenure or merit evaluation process?
       Yes ____ No ____
    b. For the advisor's information only?
       Yes ____ No ____

18. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of advisement services within your department?
    Excellent ____ Good ____ Average ____ Fair ____ Poor ____

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SHOULD BE ANSWERED BY CURRENT ADVISORS OR FACULTY MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED AS ADVISORS WITHIN THE PAST TWO ACADEMIC YEARS. PLEASE ADVANCE TO THE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS SECTION AT THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IF YOU DO NOT FIT INTO EITHER OF THESE TWO CATEGORIES.

19. Have you ever received any special assistance or training to prepare you for your advising responsibilities?
    Yes ____ No ____

    If yes, please describe _____

20. Do you know approximately how many advisees you are assigned each semester?
    Yes ____ No ____
    If yes, please specify approximate number ____

21. How many office hours per week do you make available for student contacts, including nonadvisee contacts? _____

22. On the average, how many hours should you be expected to spend with your total group of advisees?
    per week ____
    per semester ____
    per academic year ____

23. Do you feel the need for additional office hours for academic advisement beyond those needed to fulfill necessary contacts with students in your classes?
    Yes ____ Occasionally ____ No ____

24. How important is it to supplement your regular office hours at the beginning of the semester and during pre-registration and registration periods for purposes of advisement?
Not important ____ Somewhat important ____
Moderately important ____ Very important ____

25. In reference to the total number of students who contact you for advisement each academic year, please estimate the number of contacts you have with the typical advisee:
____ 0 - 1 times per academic year
____ 2 - 3 times per academic year
____ 4 or more times per academic year

26. On the average, how much time do you spend with an advisee during a typical advisement session? _____

27. Are any types of student records available to you when you meet with student advisees?
Yes ____ No ____

If yes, please specify _____

28. Please list, in order of importance, the major or recurring problems you encounter in performing the functions of an academic advisor.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Please list here any comments or recommendations you may have regarding the academic advisement process and how it may be improved.

APPENDIX B

Table 1

Analysis of Faculty Sample by Department

Department	Number of Respondents	Freq. (%)
Applied Math & Computer Science	4	16
Chemical and Environmental	5	20
Civil	3	12
Electrical	9	36
General Engineering Studies	1	4
Mechanical	1	4
Technology	2	8
	25	100

Table 2

Analysis of Faculty Sample by Status

Status	Number of Respondents	Freq. (%)
Tenured	18	72
Probationary	5	20
Temporary	2	8
	25	100

Table 3

Analysis of Sample by Rank

Academic Rank	Number of Respondents	Freq. (%)
Professor	11	44
Associate	8	32
Assistant	6	24
	25	100

Table 4

Analysis of Student Respondents by Department

Department	Number of Participants	% of Sample Population
Applied Math and Computer Science	56	16.7
Chemical and Environmental	27	8.1
Civil	12	3.6
Electrical	82	24.5
Mechanical	40	11.9
Technology	118	35.2
	335	100%

Table 5

Analysis of Student Respondent Knowledge of Advisor Name

Student Classification	Yes	No
Freshmen (1st year)	82.8%	17.2%
Sophomores (2nd year)	92.5%	7.5%
Juniors (3rd year)	100%	0.0%
Seniors (4th year)	95.0%	5.0%
Graduate/Professionals (5th year)	89.7%	14.3%

Table 6

Time Spent With Advisors

Amount of Time	Number of Responses	% of Responses
Never Seen An Advisor	9	2.7
Less Than 5 Minutes a Visit	66	19.8
About 15 Minutes	228	68.3
About 30 Minutes	29	8.7
More Than 30 Minutes	2	0.6

Table 7

Number of Assigned Advisees - Faculty Sample

Number of Advisees	Faculty Giving This Response	Frequency (%)
0 to 15	5	27.8
15 to 20	4	22.2
20 to 50	4	22.2
50 to 100	2	11.1
100 +	3	16.7
	18	100%

Table 8

Hours Available for Advising - Faculty Sample

Hours per Week	Number of Responses	% of Responses
0 to 10	4	22.2
10 to 20	3	16.7
20 to 25	3	16.7
Always Open	8	44.4
	18	100%

Table 9

Time Spent with Advisees-Faculty Response

Amount of Time	Number of Responses	% of Responses
5-15 Minutes	5	27.8
20-25 Minutes	5	27.8
About 30 Minutes	5	27.8
More Than 30 Minutes	3	16.6
	18	100%